



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,277	03/12/2001	Clifford L. Hannel	PA3544US	9408
22830	7590	08/28/2006	EXAMINER	
CARR & FERRELL LLP 2200 GENG ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94303			VU, THONG H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/720,277

Applicant(s)

HANNEL ET AL.

Examiner

Thong H. Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/05/06.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Amended claims 1-6,8-13 are pending. Claim 7 is canceled
2. This application claims the priority of 6/29/1998 (not 3/10/1997 as the previous Office Action indicated).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6,8-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6,8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Potterveld et al [Potterveld 5,878,431].

4. As per claim 1, Potterveld discloses A policy enforcement system for enforcing policies defining what actions belonging to a first type thereof first entities (i.e.: resource) defined in a computer system may perform on second entities defined in the computer system [Potterveld, the application specific rules or enforcers verify the validity of the resources or entities, col 11 lines 15-35; col 3 lines 40-60], the policy enforcement system being of the type that comprising:

a policy server , the policy server comprising a policy database of the policies and extensible configured to include policies for actions belonging to an additional type thereof , a policy including any action that a user may perform on an information resource [Potterveld,

enterprise database, col 5 lines 25-40; servers, col 6 lines 20-33; new resource is added, col 13 line 50]; and

a policy enforcer (i.e.: the application specific rules or enforcers) , the policy enforcer configured to control performance of the first type of action [Potterveld, resource aspect type, col 8 lines 1-11];

communicate a request to perform an action of the first type to the policy server [Potterveld, request services, col 9 line 60-col 10 line 10]; and

permit performance of the action [Potterveld, permit roles, col 11 lines 1-12] only if a response from the policy server indicates that the policies permit the action (i.e.: notification) [Potterveld, notification receivers, col 11 lines 35-50], and

the policy enforcer being extensible configured to comprise an additional policy enforcer, which controls performance of actions of the additional type on an information resource [Potterveld, extensible and configurable rules, col 9 lines 25-35; new association, col 10 lines 20-28; new resource name, new object, col 12 lines 14-45].

5. Claims 8, 10 contain the similar limitations set forth in claim 1. Therefore claims 8,10 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 1.

6. As per claim 2, Potterveld discloses the policy database is of the class wherein policies are defined as sets of the first entities and sets of the second entities and the policy database is further extensible to include an additional type of the first entities and/or an additional type of the second entities [Poliquin, additional resource aspect type, col 13 lines 35-65].

7. As per claim 3, Potterveld discloses an action attribute may be associated in the database with a set of the first entities and/or a set of the second entities, the action attribute specifying a manner in which an action specified in a given policy is to be performed with regard entities in the set of first entities and/or entities in the set of second entities [Potterveld, additional resource aspect type, col 13 lines 35-65].

8. As per claim 4, Potterveld discloses the database is further extensible to include an additional type of action attributes [Potterveld, enterprise database, col 5 lines 25-40].

9. As per claim 5, Potterveld discloses the additional policy enforcer controls performance of actions at a level of the computer system that is different from the level at which the policy enforcer controls performance of actions [Potterveld, new resource names, col 12 lines 14-21].

10. As per claim 6, Potterveld discloses at least one of the policy enforcers is at a location in the computer system that is remote from the policy server [Potterveld, servers, col 6 lines 20-33].

11. As per claim 9, Potterveld discloses the further condition is a time interval specification associated with the given policy, the time interval specification specifying an interval of time during which entities belonging to the given set of first entities specified in the given policy may perform the given action specified therein on entities belonging to the given set of second entities specified therein [Potterveld, scheduling, col 2 lines 22-38].

12. As per claim 11, Potterveld discloses the database is extensible to include new types of action attributes [Potterveld, additional resource aspect type, col 13 lines 35-65].

13. As per claim 12, Potterveld discloses an action attribute condition is associated in the database with an action attribute for the given policy, the action attribute condition determining whether a requesting entity belonging to the given set of first entities can perform the given action as specified in the action attribute on an entity in the given set of second entities at the time the requesting entity makes the request [Potterveld, trigger condition, col 11 lines 35-40].

14. As per claim 13, Potterveld discloses the additional type of action is defined by a user of the policy enforcement system and the policy enforcement system includes a user interface for extending the policy database by adding the user-defined additional type of action to the policy database [Potterveld, additional resource aspect type, col 13 lines 35-65].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thong Vu*, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:00AM- 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Andrew Caldwell*, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thong Vu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2142

